

| Case | WHO Grade | | | RRAS Category | | |
|------------------|-----------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|----------|
| | Grader 1 | Grader 2 | Grader 3 | Grader 1 | Grader 2 | Grader 3 |
| 1 | M | P | M | L | L | I |
| 2 | M | P | M | I | I | I |
| 3 | P | P | P | H | H | H |
| 4 | M | P | P | I | H | H |
| 5 | M | P | W | L | L | L |
| 6 | M | P | M | I | I | L |
| 7 | M | P | P | I | I | H |
| 8 | M | P | P | H | H | I |
| 9 | M | P | P | I | H | I |
| 10 | M | P | M | I | I | I |
| 11 | M | P | P | I | I | I |
| 12 | M | M | M | I | L | I |
| 13 | W | P | W | L | L | L |
| 14 | M | P | P | I | I | I |
| 15 | M | W | M | I | L | L |
| 16 | M | P | W | I | I | L |
| 17 | M | P | P | H | H | I |
| 18 | M | P | M | I | I | I |
| 19 | W | P | M | L | L | I |
| 20 | M | P | M | I | H | I |
| K = 0.136 | | | | K = 0.543 | | |

Supplementary Figure 2: Assessment of interobserver agreement. RRAS categorization offers improved agreement between three pathologists, compared to WHO grade. 20 challenging tumors were evaluated using WHO methodology (weighted kappa=0.136; **W**=well-differentiated, **M**=moderately differentiated, and **P**=poorly differentiated) and RRAS criteria (weighted kappa=0.543; **L**=low risk, **I**=intermediate risk, and **H**=high risk). Cases shaded green indicate agreement among all graders, yellow indicates agreement among 2 of 3 graders, and red indicates no agreement among any of the graders.